

ACTIVE CASES
Analysis September 2004 QA Results for Food Stamps

Sample Size: 91
(drops excluded)

Totals for September 2004:

LOCATION	TOTAL SAMPLE ISSUANCE	# of ERROR CASES	ERROR DOLLAR TOTAL	PERCENT DOLLARS IN ERROR	FFY 2004 ERROR RATE
STATEWIDE	\$16,851	12	\$947	5.6%	6.6%
MILWAUKEE	7,804	10	779	10.0%	9.1%
BAL- STATE	9,047	2	168	1.9%	4.5%

ERROR CAUSES BY TYPE:

- 9- Agency Preventable Errors
- 2- Client Errors
- 1- Agency

OVERVIEW OF THE ERRORS AND WHERE THEY OCCURRED:

Of the 9 Agency Preventable Errors, 7 were in Milwaukee, and 1 in Rock County, 1 in Brown County.

The 2 Client Reporting Errors were in Milwaukee.

The "Agency" error was in Milwaukee (explained below).

TYPES OF A.P.E. ERRORS (9):

Regular Earned Income (6) :

- Agency failed to re-verify at review (3)-all in Milwaukee
- Agency failed to budget commissions as part of earned income estimate.
- Agency failed to follow up on exceptioned/incomplete EVF.
- Agency failed to act on matches received since 2002 on earnings

Utilities: (2)

- Agency correctly budgeted heating expense but didn't re-run eligibility so the expense didn't count in the sample budget.
- Agency failed to verify and budget a heating expense the customer claimed.

Child Support Expense (1)

- Agency failed to verify and budget a CS expense claimed by customer.

TYPES of CLIENT ERRORS (2):

Rent (1): client failed to report at review that their rent had increased.

Household composition (1): client failed to report she moved in with her mother and siblings, with whom she purchased and prepared food. (This was an EBD case with no earnings so the change was required to be reported.)

AGENCY ERROR (1):

This was a combination of the client not accurately reporting his living situation and the agency worker not determining that the client is living in a group arrangement that doesn't qualify for FS. It's obscure enough that the determination was made to not consider it an A.P.E.

WHEN WERE THE AGENCY PREVENTABLE ERRORS MADE?

Of nine Agency Preventable Errors, two were made at application, five were made at review, and two were made at a reported change.

WHEN WERE THE CLIENT ERRORS MADE?

In one case the client failed to report her correct rent at re-certification. In the other the client failed to report a move and household composition change between reviews (an EBD case).

TRENDS OR RECOMMENDATIONS:

Earned Income: continues to be the most significant element in error. Five cases of the nine Agency Preventable Errors were earned income budgeting errors.

Disappointingly, three of the Milwaukee agency preventable errors could have been prevented had the worker sent the case to "Find and Fix" prior to confirmation of benefits after application or review (as mandated by the state and Milwaukee County).

BIGGEST CONTRIBUTORS: The cases that caused the largest dollar errors for September 2004 (including client errors):

Milwaukee County, \$197 Agency Preventable Error:

Earned Income: This error occurred because the agency worker failed to act on alerts since October 2002 about employment of a household member. There was also an error in Child Support averaging. **This error could have been caught had the case been sent to the "Find and Fix" project as directed.**

Milwaukee County, \$165 Agency Preventable Error:

Earned Income: This error occurred because the agency failed to re-verify and re-calculate wages at re-certification.

Milwaukee County, \$135 Agency Preventable Error:

Earned Income: This error occurred because the agency worker failed to budget commissions paid to the employee. The information was known to the agency.

Rock County, \$114 Agency Preventable Error:

Earned Income: The agency received an employment verification form that was incomplete, and that was so noted on the AFEI detail screen. However the ESS never followed up on the missing information, resulting in incorrect budgeting.